

the defense of democratic Europe. The Senate recognized by its far-sighted action that our future—indeed our own freedom—is inextricably bound to Europe.

The success of the fledgling NATO was by no means certain. Western Europe was made up of a jumble of nations, several of which had only recently been at each others' throats. Germany and France alone had fought each other three times in 74 years. The three western zones of Germany, which were not the Federal Republic and, in fact, were not invited to join NATO.

The countries of Western Europe were economically weak, not yet having recovered nearly fully from the devastation of World War II.

Several European NATO members had strong Communist parties whose loyalty and commitment to democracy were suspect.

Mr. President, our predecessors took a gamble. Fortunately for us and our children—and I hope for our grandchildren—NATO succeeded beyond the Senate's fondest expectations.

As we all know, for 40 years, it kept Soviet imperialism at bay, thereby providing the security umbrella under which democratic Western Europe could recover socially and economically, and thrive.

In the process, NATO expanded its membership three times to welcome Greece and Turkey, West Germany, and Spain. With each expansion the Alliance was strengthened.

Largely thanks to NATO's persistence, communism in most of Europe crumbled, including in the Soviet Union.

Now, nearly 50 years after our predecessors met the challenge of their time, we are called upon, once again, to take up the torch.

Three highly qualified democracies that chafed under the Communist yoke for four decades are now candidates for membership in NATO. Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic have already rejoined the West politically and socially. Tonight we can vote to readmit them to the West's security framework.

In a larger sense we will be righting a historical injustice forced upon the Poles, Czechs, and Hungarians by Joseph Stalin.

Mr. President, NATO enlargement is squarely in America's national interest. It is in Europe's interest. And yes—by stabilizing a historic crucible of violence in East-Central Europe—it is in Russia's interest.

I am proud to be able to play a small part in this historic occasion. I will cast my vote with conviction to ratify the Resolution of Ratification, and I urge my colleagues to join me. I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I shall cast my vote in opposition for the reasons that I have stated over the past

several days in what I regard is an excellent debate. But if it is the will of two-thirds of the U.S. Senate that this ratification go forward, then I commit, and I hope others will commit, who have been in opposition, to do our very best to make it work.

I think it is going to pose a mighty challenge to make it work, but if that is the decision of this body, for which I have infinite respect, then I commit as a member of the Armed Services Committee, where I will have some special responsibilities, to make it work.

But I also say that I shall be among others who will maintain a vigil as to the future with an open and objective mind but still predicated in my own thoughts on what I have expressed on this floor about future additions of other nations in a manner that would be untimely to make this treaty last another 50 years. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back on both sides? If so, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification with certain conditions and declarations to the Protocols of the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 80, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 117 Ex.]

YEAS—80

Abraham	Faircloth	Lott
Akaka	Feingold	Lugar
Allard	Feinstein	Mack
Baucus	Ford	McCain
Bennett	Frist	McConnell
Biden	Glenn	Mikulski
Bingaman	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Bond	Graham	Murkowski
Boxer	Gramm	Murray
Breaux	Grams	Nickles
Brownback	Grassley	Reed
Burns	Gregg	Robb
Byrd	Hagel	Roberts
Campbell	Hatch	Rockefeller
Chafee	Helms	Roth
Cleland	Hollings	Santorum
Coats	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Cochran	Inouye	Sessions
Collins	Johnson	Shelby
Coverdell	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
D'Amato	Kerrey	Snowe
Daschle	Kerry	Stevens
DeWine	Kohl	Thomas
Dodd	Landrieu	Thompson
Domenici	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Durbin	Levin	Torricelli
Enzi	Lieberman	

NAYS—19

Ashcroft	Conrad	Harkin
Bryan	Craig	Hutchinson
Bumpers	Dorgan	Inhofe

Jeffords	Reid	Wellstone
Kempthorne	Smith (NH)	Wyden
Leahy	Specter	
Moynihan	Warner	

NOT VOTING—1

Kyl

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 80, the nays are 19. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification, as amended, is agreed to.

The resolution of ratification, as amended, was agreed to.

(The Text of the Resolution of Ratification, as amended, will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. BIDEN. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will now go into legislative session.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the bill, H.R. 3579, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill H.R. 3579, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of April 30, 1998.)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the House passed earlier today the emergency supplemental appropriations conference report by substantial margin.

I want to begin by expressing my appreciation to my friend and colleague from West Virginia, Sen. BYRD, for his assistance and cooperation in presenting this bill to the Senate.

Our Committee worked in a bipartisan manner through every step of the process of moving this emergency supplemental bill through the Senate, and back from conference.

I strongly urge all my colleagues to vote in support of this bill, which addresses urgent funding requirements for the Department of Defense, and many agencies responsible for dealing with natural disasters.

The conference report provides \$2.8 billion for emergency defense accounts.

These amounts are not offset by any reductions to defense or non-defense appropriations—they are treated genuinely as emergencies.

We recommend these appropriations based on the expenditures already made by the military, and recognizing the devastating effect of failing to provide these funds now.

The Congress will have the opportunity to consider the proposed funding for missions in Bosnia and southwest Asia in the fiscal year 1999 defense authorization and appropriations bills. This supplemental funding does not prejudice the decisions we face later this year.

The conference report provides \$2.6 billion in nondefense emergency appropriations, for FEMA, the Departments of Agriculture, Transportation and the Army Corps of Engineers.

These appropriations are offset by budget authority reductions to contract authority available for HUD sec. 8 housing and the airport improvement program.

Based on extensive discussions with the administration, these amounts are not required to execute these programs during the remainder of fiscal year 1998.

We do face the need to monitor these accounts closely for fiscal year 1999, and some additional funds may be needed for the HUD section 8 housing.

Mr. President, I very much regret that the conference report does not include the funding passed by the Senate for the International Monetary Fund.

The House wishes to take up IMF funding in a separate vehicle, which has been reported by the House Appropriations Committee.

Speaker GINGRICH has committed to holding a vote on the IMF bill in the House. I hope that vote comes later this month, so that we can assure the markets in Asia, and the global financial community, of our Nation's commitment to maintaining economic stability and growth.

Mr. President, before closing, I want to note the exceptional work undertaken by the staff of the House and Senate appropriations committees.

Our conference met for the first time at 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, and completed most of its work Wednesday night at 6:00 p.m.

By 9:30 a.m. today, the official papers were prepared and ready to file—a remarkable achievement.

I want to especially note the contributions of Jay Kimmitt, Jack Conway and Richard Larson of the Senate committee staff, and John Mikal, Dennis Kedzior and Chuck Parkinson of the House committee staff.

Mr. President, we need to pass this bill tonight, and I believe we have returned to the Senate a good bill, that merits the Senate's support.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I congratulate all the conferees on this very important disaster assistance supplemental appropriation bill, and in particular, the chairman and ranking

member of the House Appropriations Committee, Chairman LIVINGSTON and Mr. OBEY, as well as Senator STEVENS, who chaired the conference, for the successful completion of what has been a very difficult conference.

Many of the issues that came before the conference and required extensive debate were extraneous matters that had nothing to do with the primary purposes of the bill, to provide emergency appropriations for our men and women in uniform in Bosnia and Southwest Asia and to provide emergency disaster assistance to those of our citizens who have suffered from the devastating series of natural disasters that have beset the country in recent months—from the ice storms this past winter in the northeast to the flooding in the western and southern portions of the nation, as well as the recent killer tornadoes throughout the southern states. There was very little disagreement on these matters among the conferees. We all understood the urgency of providing the necessary resources for these emergency purposes.

Nevertheless, as I say, we were faced with a number of potential controversial, extraneous legislative riders which had to be debated and disposed of. Those issues ranged from whether to include language in this conference agreement that was in neither version of the bill relating to such things as: interest rates on guaranteed student loans; whether to insert portions of the recently-completed Agricultural Research Conference Report; and whether to override the President's Executive Order prohibiting the importation of assault weapons. Such extraneous issues consumed a considerable amount of time but, I am pleased to say, most were not adopted by the conference.

In all, the bill contains some \$2.86 billion to cover the cost of the military operations in Bosnia and Southwest Asia, together with \$2.6 billion in emergency disaster assistance payments, principal among which are \$1.6 billion for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, \$259 million in emergency Federal-aid highway relief, and \$130 million for community development block grants. The appropriations for the Department of Defense, as well as the disaster assistance payments were requested by the President as emergency appropriations and, as such, under the Budget Enforcement Act, require no offsets. The Senate version of the bill, therefore, contained no offsets for any of the aforementioned emergency items. Nevertheless the House conferees insisted that the appropriations totaling \$2.6 billion for emergency assistance for natural disasters be offset, in budget authority only, by rescissions of \$2.3 billion in Section 8 Housing authority reserves and \$241 million in excess contract authority in the FAA Airport Improvement Program.

I am pleased that the conferees accepted the Senate amendment which provided the full \$550 million request of

the President for veterans compensation and pensions. These funds were not included in the House version of the bill before the conferees. The funds are needed to accommodate the additional costs associated with the 1998 cost-of-living adjustment of 2.1 percent for compensation beneficiaries; an increase in the estimated number of compensation beneficiaries; and an increase in the average payments to compensation and pension beneficiaries. It is important that we keep faith with our veterans, who have sacrificed so much in their service to our country, and I am delighted that the conferees agreed to provide these funds on a timely basis so that there will be no interruption in these payments to our veterans. In addition, the bill also includes some \$142 million in appropriations for various agencies to enable them to continue their operations throughout the balance of the fiscal year. These latter amounts are appropriately offset by rescissions.

I am pleased that the conference accepted my amendment to the Senate version of the bill, which was cosponsored by the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. STEVENS, and which requires the President to seek support aggressively from our allies and friends to share the burden of containing the Iraqi menace in the Middle East. In my view, Mr. President, this provision is essential as I do not believe that we should shoulder this burden alone. To this end, I note that the distinguished chairman of the committee, as well as selected other members of the committee, will shortly depart for the Middle East in order to impress upon the leaders of our allies in that area of the world the importance that we place upon increased burdensharing by our allies in this very critical aspect of international peacekeeping that is so important to stability in today's world.

Finally, Mr. President, I am disappointed that the House conferees were unable to accept a Senate amendment offered by myself, Senator DORGAN, and other Senators to establish a congressional commission to study causes and consequences of our trade deficits. I have noted that the trade deficit numbers for February are now at a decade-high monthly level, primarily as a result of the Japanese economic problem. We have not had a comprehensive review of our national trade policies since 1970—nearly 30 years ago. This legislation has been 3 years in the making, and my Senate amendment would have established a congressional commission composed of twelve members—six members nominated by the Senate and six members nominated by the House, four of whom shall be Members of congress. Nevertheless, the conferees did agree in the Statement of Managers to include the following:

“The managers considered, but did not adopt, language that would create a Trade Deficit Review Commission, as

proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree that serious concerns exist regarding continuing trade deficits and intend to work with the legislative committees of jurisdiction to establish such a Commission, including in the context of the fiscal year 1999 appropriations process."

Mr. President, this is a matter of high priority. Senator DORGAN and I will be monitoring this important matter closely. We hope that the various legislative committees of jurisdiction will take up this issue at a very early date. In any case, the members can count on Senator DORGAN and me to revisit this matter on a timely basis later this year if no action has been taken in the interim.

I know that the administration is disappointed that the conference has not chosen to include payments to the International Monetary Fund. This matter was debated at great length during the conference and it was determined that the House, at this time, was not prepared to yield on this issue.

I, again, thank all conferees for their diligent efforts throughout the past week in resolving all of the difficult issues faced in the conference and particularly the chairman of our committee, Senator STEVENS, who chaired this, his first supplemental appropriations conference, with great patience, skill, and good humor.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I express my sincere gratitude to the manager of the bill, Senator STEVENS, and to the chair of the Subcommittee on Interior, Senator GORTON. Yesterday, I raised with them an issue of concern regarding amendments to the Coastal Barrier Resources System, a program under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, that the conferees were considering. These amendment would have adjusted the boundaries of several units currently in the System in Florida, and they are quite controversial.

Senator STEVENS and Senator GORTON were both very gracious and accommodating to my concerns. They chose not to include the amendments, and instead included language in the report stating that the managers will work with the committees of jurisdiction to explore the possibility of a legislative remedy in the context of future appropriations bill or other legislative vehicle. I very much appreciate this collaborative approach.

Again, I express my sincere thanks to my esteemed colleagues, Senators STEVENS and GORTON.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Supplemental Conference report, and I oppose it for the same reasons I opposed the original Senate Supplemental Appropriations bill in the Appropriations Committee.

While I want to go on record supporting the funding for our operations in Bosnia and Iraq, I am voting against this bill because I believe we should

have found a way to offset this defense spending. I understand that some of the funding was unanticipated, but certainly not all of it. If we are truly committed to a balanced budget, as I believe we should be, we need to make the tough choices to reduce spending in other areas of defense spending to pay for this bill.

I also want to state that I opposed the House bill which offset defense spending with cuts in domestic programs. Separate defense and domestic spending levels were set in last year's historic balanced budget accord, and I see no reason to revisit those fundamental decisions now. Except for truly unanticipated emergencies, the Department of Defense ought to make the tough decision that allows it to live within its budget. If the non-emergency defense spending in this bill was not important enough to make the Department of Defense's FY 1998 budget, it is not important enough to justify raiding cash-strapped domestic programs.

And finally, I am disappointed that this legislation does not include funding for the International Monetary Fund's quota increase and New Arrangements to Borrow. The situation in Asia has clearly demonstrated that while the mission of the IMF is now more important than ever, the current resources of the fund are not adequate to meet the demands of that mission. We have a responsibility to every American, whether they be consumer, business person, job seeker or job holder, to promote policies that help grow the global economy to which the American economy is increasingly and inextricably linked. Simply put, our future depends on the future of our neighbors and trading partners. Many of my colleagues have raised legitimate concerns regarding IMF reform, concerns which should be addressed. But our primary task for today was to provide the IMF with the resources necessary to continue its important mission, and I regret that Congress failed to live up to that responsibility.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE CHIEF

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I rise to make a few remarks concerning Section 10007, a general provision included in the conference report for the emergency supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998. My amendment is a technical amendment clarifying that the terms of the contract recently signed by the new Police Chief for the District of Columbia are valid and not in conflict with existing law. The new Police Chief, Charles Ramsey, was unanimously approved for the job by the D.C. Council, the Mayor, the D.C. Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority (the Control Board) and the Mayor's Citizens Advisory Panel. The employment contract, which called for Chief Ramsey to report to the Control Board,

was signed by the Mayor without objection on April 21, 1998. An April 23, 1998 legal opinion written by the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel challenges the legality of the contract. This opinion has created a potential crisis of uncertainty over who Chief Ramsey will report to and threatens to sidetrack the Chief as he begins to clean house at a very troubled department. My amendment simply states that the Chief's April 21, 1998 contract is valid. It also makes clear that, so long as the Control Board—which Congress created—exists, all future Chiefs of Police will work under the same reporting conditions as Chief Ramsey. This amendment is imperative if we are to support the Control Board, Chief Ramsey, and the citizens of the District of Columbia, who deserve a police department that can protect them on the streets and in their neighborhoods.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Chairman Stevens, Senator Bond, Senator Domenici and their staffs for their efforts on behalf of the citizens of Alabama. Over the last several months, Alabama has suffered greatly as a result of multiple natural disasters. As the state was addressing the flooding in its Southern regions, a series of violent tornados devastated portions of Northern Alabama. These terrible events resulted in loss of life and extensive property and infrastructure damage. In many cases, whole communities were destroyed. While communities have banded together to begin the process of rebuilding their lives, the need for assistance is obvious to anyone who has viewed the destruction firsthand.

I appreciate the efforts of the Senator from Missouri as the Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on VA/HUD and Independent Agencies to increase the funding provided by the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program. Although there has been extensive promotion of buyouts and relocation, it is my understanding that only 3 million dollars is available to the State of Alabama through hazard mitigation funding for this purpose. These funds are dramatically insufficient to meet the current needs and demands of the communities hit by these disasters. It is my understanding that the State of Alabama will be eligible for the CDBG funds included in this bill to respond to the flood and tornado disasters. Is it the Chairman's understanding that this funding could be used by the State for buyouts?

Mr. BOND. As you know, in large part to your help, the conference report to the FY 1998 Supplemental appropriations bill includes \$130 million for emergency CDBG funding that is intended to meet unmet emergency disaster needs by supplementing the existing, more traditional disaster programs administered through FEMA, the SBA and the Corps of Engineers. While there remains significant concerns over HUD's administration of